

REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the final Office Action dated December 30, 2010. By way of this amendment, Claims 66, 68, and 70-87 are pending in this application, of which Claims 66, 84, and 85 are the independent claims. Claims 66, 68, 84, and 85 are amended herein, and Claim 67 has been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. No new matter has been added. Support for the claim amendments can be found throughout the originally filed application, including, for example, in paragraphs [12] and [51] of the application. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Interview Summary

Applicants would initially like to thank Examiner Belani for the courteous telephonic interview extended to the Applicants' counsel, Ahsan Shaikh, on March 14, 2011. During the telephonic interview, Examiner Belani indicated that the above-identified amendments to Claim 85 would overcome the rejection of Claim 85 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. No agreement was reached regarding the rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C § 112, Second Paragraph

Claim 85 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter that Applicants regard as the invention.

In accordance with the Examiner's suggestion, Applicants have amended Claim 85 to recite a "client computing device." Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 85 as amended particularly points out and distinctly claims the subject matter that Applicants regard as the invention.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 85 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, are respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 66, 70, 80, 82, 84, and 85 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,244,957 (“Walker”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,145,083 (“Shaffer”). Claims 67, 68, 72-74, 77-79, and 81 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Walker in view of Shaffer and further in view of U.S. Patent App. Pub. No. 2005/0080915 (“Shoemaker”). Claims 71 and 76 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Walker in view of Shaffer and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,854,009 (“Hughes”). Claim 75 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Walker in view of Shaffer and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,876,644 (“Hsu”). Claims 83 and 86 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Walker in view of Shaffer and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,089,508 (“Wright”). Claim 87 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Walker in view of Shaffer and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,219,233 (“Hendriks”).

By way of this amendment, each of the independent claims, namely Claims 66, 84, and 85, has been amended to incorporate the subject matter of canceled Claim 67 as well as the limitation “communications occurring through the first communication channel are suspended when the communications session is locked.” Accordingly, each of the independent claims recites a “computing device [that] is configured to facilitate communication of [a] communications session using a first communication channel, and [that] is configured to facilitate communication of [a] lock session signal, [an] unlock session signal, and []

identification information using a second communication channel, and wherein communications occurring through the first communication channel are suspended when the communications session is locked.” It is respectfully submitted that the applied references, whether alone or in combination, in view of what was known to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, do not teach or suggest at least these limitations of the independent claims.

The Office Action concedes that Walker and Shaffer do not disclose facilitating communication of a secure communications session using a first communication channel and configured to facilitate communication of a lock session signal, an unlock session signal, and identification information using a second communication channel, as featured in canceled Claim 67. Office Action, p.15. The Office Action, however, relies on Shoemaker in FIG. 1B and paragraph [0087] as disclosing this feature.

Shoemaker in FIG. 1B discloses a user-interface channel 210 and a media channel 208.

Regarding these channels, Shoemaker discloses:

To transmit [a] computing experience 202 in high quality, the user interface is communicated through a user-interface channel 210 and the media component(s) 206 are communicated through a media channel 208 via network 211....

User-interface channel 210 communicates user-interface component 204 to remote component 212. Terminal Server and Terminal Client Services, offered by Microsoft Corporation of Redmond, Wash., provide an exemplary user-interface channel 210. Any remotable protocol can be used to transmit data through user-interface channel 210. Exemplary protocols include the T-120 series protocol and HTTP (Hyper Text Transfer Protocol).

Media channel 208 is separate from user-interface channel 210. Media channel 208 is used to transmit bandwidth-intensive experiences such as video and others listed above.

Shoemaker, paragraphs [0008], [0015], and [0016]. Shoemaker in paragraph [0087] discloses that the Remote Desktop Protocol (RDP) “is a multichannel capable protocol allowing for separate virtual channels for carrying serial device communication and presentation data from

the server.” Shoemaker does not, however, anywhere teach or even suggest communications occurring through a first communication channel for a communications session are suspended when a communications session is locked using a second communication channel. For example, Shoemaker does not teach or even suggest suspending communications occurring through one of the user-interface channel 210, the media channel 208, or a virtual channel of RDP for a communication session when the communications session is locked using a different communication channel.

The remaining references, Hughes, Hsu, Wright, and Hendriks, are not understood to remedy the foregoing deficiencies of Walker, Shaffer, and Shoemaker. Specifically, the remaining references, whether alone or in combination, in view of what was known to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, do not teach or suggest at least the limitations of a “computing device [that] is configured to facilitate communication of [a] communications session using a first communication channel, and [that] is configured to facilitate communication of [a] lock session signal, [an] unlock session signal, and [] identification information using a second communication channel, and wherein communications occurring through the first communication channel are suspended when the communications session is locked,” recited in each of the independent claims.

Accordingly, the applied references, either alone or in combination, in view of what was known to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, are not understood to disclose, teach, or suggest the features of the independent claims, which are believed to be in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of the independent claims are respectfully requested.

The other claims currently under consideration in the application are dependent from the independent claims discussed above and therefore are believed to be allowable over the applied references for at least similar reasons. Because each dependent claim is deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, the individual consideration of each on its own merits is respectfully requested. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of the dependent claims are respectfully requested.

The absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue, or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue, or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be other reasons for patentability of any or all claims that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede, or an actual concession of, any issue with regard to any claim, or any cited art, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment or cancellation of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment or cancellation.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the entire application is believed to be in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested at the Examiner's earliest convenience. Should the Examiner have any questions, please call the undersigned at the phone number listed below.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 502624 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,
McDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP

/Soyeon (Karen) Pak Laub/
Soyeon (Karen) Pak Laub, Registration No. 39,266

18191 Von Karman Ave., Suite 500
Irvine, CA 92612-7108
Phone: 949.851.0633 AAS:kcc
Facsimile: 949.851.9348
Date: March 30, 2011

**Please recognize our Customer No. 31824
as our correspondence address.**